ML
3799
.N38
2014

CHARLES HOMER HASKINS
PRIZE LECTURE FOR 2014

A Life of Learning

Bruno Nettl

ACLS OCCASIONAL PAPER, No. 71

Theology Library
CLAREMONT
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
Claremont, CA

The 2014 Charles Homer Haskins Prize Lecture was presented at the ACLS Annual Meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on May 9, 2014.

©2014 by Bruno Nettl

CONTENTS

On Charles Homer Haskins *iv*

Haskins Prize Lecturers *v*

Brief Biography of Bruno Nettl *vi*

Introduction *viii*
by Pauline Yu

A Life of Learning 1
by Bruno Nettl

ON CHARLES HOMER HASKINS

Charles Homer Haskins (1870–1937), for whom the ACLS lecture series is named, was the first chairman of the American Council of Learned Societies, from 1920 to 1926. He began his teaching career at The Johns Hopkins University, where he received the B.A. degree in 1887 and the Ph.D. in 1890. He later taught at the University of Wisconsin and at Harvard University, where he served as dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences from 1908 to 1924. At the time of his retirement in 1931, he was Henry Charles Lea Professor of Medieval History. He served as president of the American Historical Association in 1922, and was a founder and the second president of the Medieval Academy of America (1926).

A great American teacher, Charles Homer Haskins also did much to establish the reputation of American scholarship abroad. His distinction was recognized in honorary degrees from Strasbourg, Padua, Manchester, Paris, Louvain, Caen, Harvard, Wisconsin, and Allegheny College, where in 1883 he had begun his higher education at the age of 13.

HASKINS PRIZE LECTURERS

2014	Bruno Nettl
2013	Robert Alter
2012	Joyce Appleby
2011	Henry Glassie
2010	Nancy Siraisi
2009	William Labov
2008	Theodor Meron
2007	Linda Nochlin
2006	Martin E. Marty
2005	Gerda Lerner
2004	Peter Gay
2003	Peter Brown
2002	Henry A. Millon
2001	Helen Vendler
2000	Geoffrey Hartman
1999	Clifford Geertz
1998	Yi-Fu Tuan
1997	Natalie Zemon Davis
1996	Robert William Fogel
1995	Phyllis Pray Bober
1994	Robert K. Merton
1993	Annemarie Schimmel
1992	Donald W. Meinig
1991	Milton Babbit
1990	Paul Oskar Kristeller
1989	Judith N. Shklar
1988	John Hope Franklin
1987	Carl E. Schorske
1986	Milton V. Anastos
1985	Lawrence Stone
1984	Mary Rosamond Haas
1983	Maynard Mack

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF BRUNO NETTL

Bruno Nettl was born in 1930 in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and emigrated to the United States with his parents at the age of nine, settling first in Princeton, New Jersey, and then in Bloomington, Indiana. He studied principally at Indiana University (PhD, 1953) and, after several years on the faculty of Wayne State University and the University of Kiel, Germany, has spent most of his career, since 1964, teaching at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where he is now professor emeritus of music and anthropology.

Professor Nettl's main research interests are ethnomusicological theory and method, music of Native American cultures, and music of the Middle East, especially Iran. He has done field work with the Blackfoot people of Montana, and in Iran, Israel, and India, and he has an interest in the music history and folk music of his native Czech Republic. Professor Nettl has been focusing in recent years on the study of improvisatory music, the understanding of musical change throughout the world, and especially the intellectual history of ethnomusicology. He has published many articles and more than a dozen books, the best known being *The Study of Ethnomusicology* (1983, 2nd ed. 2005), *The Western Impact on World Music* (1985), *Blackfoot Musical Thought: Comparative Perspectives* (1989), *Heartland Excursions: Ethnomusicological Perspectives on Schools of Music* (1995), and *Encounters in Ethnomusicology* (2002), a professional memoir. Certain of his books have been translated into French, Spanish, Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Persian.

As a teacher, Professor Nettl gave courses on a large number of musicological and ethnomusicological subjects, including "Introduction to World Music," "Music of the Middle East," "Native American Music," "Music of the Czech Lands," "Anthropology of Music," and seminars on improvisation, music and culture change, the history of musicology, and the interaction of Western and non-Western musics. He is the advisor of over 30 dissertations, including those of current faculty members at institutions such as Harvard, UCLA, University of Texas, University of Chicago, and Carleton, Colorado, and Smith Colleges.

Professor Nettl has received honorary doctorates from the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois, Carleton College,

and Kenyon College. He is an honorary member of the American Musicological Society and the Society for Ethnomusicology and a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Professor Nettl has taught as visiting professor at Harvard, Northwestern, and the universities of Chicago, Minnesota, Washington, and Texas, among others, and served as Benedict distinguished professor of music at Carleton College. In recent years, he has published an edited collection (with coeditor Gabriel Solis), *Musical Improvisation: Art, Education, and Society* (2009), and is the author of *Nettl's Elephant: On the History of Ethnomusicology* (2010). He continues teaching part time in the University of Illinois School of Music.

Professor Nettl has been married for over 60 years to Wanda, an artist. They have two daughters: the older one is a dancer, choreographer, and educator of dance, and the younger one is a singer-songwriter. His hobbies are baking Viennese cakes and making marzipan with his wife, low-stakes poker games, and writing light verse for family and friends.

INTRODUCTION

Professor Bruno Nettl delivered the 2014 Charles Homer Haskins Prize Lecture on May 9 in Philadelphia, at the annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies. His lecture is the thirty-second in the annual lecture series, which is named in honor of the first chairman of the American Council of Learned Societies. Each year, the Executive Committee of the Delegates of ACLS selects the prize-winner and lecturer from the many excellent nominations put forth by our community.

Haskins lecturers are asked "to reflect on a lifetime of work as a scholar, on the motives, the chance determinations, the satisfactions (and the dissatisfactions) of the life of learning; and to explore through one's own life the larger, institutional life of scholarship." Rather than presenting the products of his or her scholarly research, the speaker is asked "to share with other scholars the personal process of a particular lifetime of learning."

Professor Nettl's long and distinguished scholarly career in the fields of musicology and ethnomusicology lends itself well to this task. Over the past six decades, he has authored, coauthored, or edited nearly three dozen books, on topics ranging from the music and cultural traditions of the Blackfoot people of Montana, to the popular and classical music of Iran, to the folk music and culture of his native Czech Republic. As Gage Averill, former president of the Society of Ethnomusicology, wrote in his letter of nomination, Professor Nettl "has consistently refused an a priori separation of the study of non-Western musics from those of the West, and as a result, he has been an effective bridge-builder to other musical disciplines such as historical musicology and music theory." His colleagues and many admirers point to the bridges Professor Nettl has built to non-musical fields as well, including folklore, performance studies, and anthropology, but also intellectual history, linguistics, and even occasional poetry.

Professor Nettl's capacious intellectual biography has come to be inseparable from the formation and development of the

field of ethnomusicology itself. As one reviewer of his work has noted, "Nettl's particular perspective precedes even widespread adoption of the term 'ethnomusicology,' and he has been a consistently nourishing contributor to the field's intellectual life for what is arguably, depending upon when exactly one locates its point of origin, its entire duration."[1]

As a founder of the modern discipline of ethnomusicology, Professor Nettl has guided the theoretical and methodological orientation of the field while inspiring thousands of young scholars to explore the riches of the world's musics and expressive arts. In addition to his popular career in the classroom, where he continues to teach even now as an emeritus professor, he has directed over 50 theses and dissertations. His clarity of expression and thoughtful pedagogy have made him welcome even in the elementary school classroom, where for many years he has shared his abiding interest in Native American music with wide-eyed first-graders. Commanding the attention of seven-year-olds is no small feat, but that is merely one aspect of Professor Nettl's campaign to communicate the results of advanced humanities research in a clear and accessible way.

It can be all too easy for a scholar to make valuable contributions to the flow of knowledge without reaching beyond his field to other disciplinary communities, or to the public whose lives are enriched every day by the humanities. Professor Nettl's career as a visionary teacher-scholar, dedicated administrator, and generous mentor has slipped beyond the boundaries of the discipline he helped found to touch the lives of generations of students and colleagues. His life of learning, a life of passionate humanism, is an example to us all.

— Pauline Yu, President
American Council of Learned Societies

NOTE

[1] Guest-Scott, Anthony. "Review of *Nettl's Elephant: On the History of Ethnomusicology.*" *Journal of Folklore Research.* 6 May 2012. Web. 1 May 2014.

BRUNO NETTL

A Life of Learning

It's a great understatement for me to say that I feel enormously honored to be here today, contributing to this series of lectures, many of them given by scholars who are legends in humanistic studies. The honor is very special because I'm representing a relatively small and newish field, ethnomusicology. I thank the ACLS, and I also wish to thank the Society for Ethnomusicology for nominating me.

This field of ethnomusicology in which I work has been defined in many ways. It has not been widely known, but I think it truly "arrived" a few months ago when it was the answer in a *New York Times* crossword puzzle. In general, ethnomusicologists contemplate the music of the world's societies as art, but also, more importantly, as a domain of culture, individually and comparatively. They usually position themselves between musicology and anthropology. Theirs is a field of great breadth. The methods of research include the participant-observer style of fieldwork that is standard in social anthropology, the examination of documents and artifacts in the style of historians and archeologists, and learning performance on what may appear exotic instruments at the feet of native music masters. And everything in-between—and more. There are many things we wish to accomplish. These include gaining a thorough understanding of individual non-Western and folk musics, present and past, and interpreting the interaction of contemporary cultures through their music. We wish to know such things as why the music of Native American people sounds so different from the traditional music of Tibet. But for this central question, I have no answer and no theory.

Note: The audio clips that accompanied Professor Nettl's lecture are available in the video of the lecture on the ACLS website, at <http://www.acls.org>.

What we now call ethnomusicology began largely in central Europe in the late nineteenth century, and it was called "comparative musicology." The word "comparative" was a kind of code word for "intercultural," and did not denote a lifetime spent making comparisons. For some 60 years, this field had very few adherents, but during the period of World War II and the following decade, it experienced very significant changes: Its center moved to the United States, its population increased enormously, and it took new directions. For one thing, a kind of bifurcation occurred: One group of scholars, who considered themselves principally anthropologists, were interested in studying music as or in culture, and concentrated on the musics of indigenous societies; another, approaching the field more as the comprehension of art, emphasized the study of performance, concentrating on Asian classical music traditions. But these two branches, never far apart, have now largely merged. Most of our graduate students study a good bit of anthropology, and most learn to play or sing in the course of their research. Beginning as positivists, we quickly moved to a more interpretive stance, and, dealing as we do with many of the world's oppressed and impoverished peoples, we have increasingly moved to a position of advocacy.

There's one thing we have not done: None of us has tried to prove that the music he or she studies is greater than others. We try to analyze the judgments made by the societies we study, but we ourselves are not judgmental. We are fundamentally egalitarians. Each of us, to be sure, is eager to defend the music of the people we study as special or unique, but, while we all have our personal preferences, none of us, I think, is willing to disparage or denigrate any of the world's musics.

People often ask me how, in 1950, I got into what was then a quite obscure field. Well, I owe you just a bit of personal history. First, a word about my teachers.

Most immediate were my parents. They, and I, then aged nine, escaped from our native Czechoslovakia just after World War II had begun, and I participated in the beginning of the Nazi era, the immigrant experience, and the aftermath of the Holocaust.

From my mother, Gertrude Nettl, a concert pianist and piano teacher, I learned an abiding interest in Western classical music. She tried—but I'm afraid she had little success— to get me to practice piano and violin. My father, Paul Nettl, a well-known scholar of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century music, may have unintentionally pointed me towards ethnomusicology—because of his interest in obscure composers, and in minorities in the Austro-Hungarian Empire such as Czechs, Jews, and the German-speaking population of Bohemia.

And so, in a way, I felt inclined to take over the family business, as it were, though like virtually anyone around the age of 18, I also had an impulse to rebel against my family's values. On both fronts, a rescue of sorts came through a course titled "Folk and Primitive Music" that had just been introduced at my alma mater, Indiana University, by Professor George Herzog, newly arrived on campus. I took it as an elective, and I became, as we say, hooked. Dr. Herzog, a major figure in bringing the study of non-Western music to North America, became my principal advisor, and if I am sometimes regarded as a kind of centrist among ethnomusicologists, it is probably because this also was his position. He established a perspective that combined a number of approaches: One was that of his teacher in Berlin, Erich von Hornbostel, the man who in the first decades of the century was making a kind of survey of as many of the world's musics as he could, from recordings, analyzing, and making notations. Then there was the work of Herzog's fellow-Hungarian Béla Bartók, the great composer, but also a distinguished student of Hungarian and other Balkan folk music, whose purpose was discovering the authentic and the ancient. And when Herzog moved from Europe to Columbia University for his PhD studies, he learned the perspective of his mentor Franz Boas, father of American anthropology, who emphasized comprehensive fieldwork and held the belief that each society's history was unique, the result of natural and human environments. Moreover, Herzog was affected by the study of linguistics as developed in the United States by Edward Sapir and Leonard Bloomfield, and of folklore as developed mainly in Scandinavia. My own studies held this kind of eclecticism.

I also had other influential teachers at Indiana University, among them Carl Voegelin, distinguished student of American Indian languages famed for trying to classify all 2,000 of them; Harold Driver, ethnographer who wrote what has been called the best comprehensive survey of American Indian cultures; and Stith Thompson, the grand old man of American folkloristics, author of the multi-volume *Motif-Index of Folk Literature*, and principal teacher of the first school of American folklorists. One important thing I learned from them, as a group: In formulating research projects, and in planning one's intellectual career, one should always think big. My students will tell you that in advising their dissertation work, I tell them also to "think big."

Wishing to get away from home, and trying to get done before being drafted (which never happened), I finished my degrees rather too quickly, married Wanda (who is still my wife), started a family, got a temporary teaching job, and then found that much of what I should have learned in college and graduate school I now had to learn on my own. I'm not sure I'd recommend that particular path.

But I must talk about another group of teachers who played a role in my life later on. They are the people from whom I learned in the course of field research. Usually they are called "informants" or "consultants," or sometimes "interlocutors," but "teacher" is a more appropriate term. I can't claim to have done nearly as much field research as many of my colleagues, but these teachers turned out to play a huge role in my education throughout my life. A couple of snapshots: An Arapaho Indian elder, curiously named William Shakespeare, taught me that different cultures have varying notions of sameness and difference in music; thus, two of his songs that sounded alike to me were, to him, distinct; two that I thought were very different were, to him, variants of the same. From Calvin Boy, a Blackfoot man in Montana, I learned about the complexity of the concept of song ownership and social control of music in his culture. From Nour-Ali Boroumand, a distinguished musician in the traditional classical music culture of Tehran, I learned a canon of music that was used by each musician uniquely as the basis of improvisation. From Dr. S. Ramanathan, an out-

standing musician and teacher of South Indian music, I learned about the ways tradition and modernity interact in the musical culture of Madras or Chennai. I'm happy to have a chance to pay homage to some of these principal teachers.

But I'd be remiss if I didn't also acknowledge the many things I have learned, as a teacher, from students, mainly of course at the University of Illinois, particularly from those whose dissertations I had the good fortune of advising (many of whom, incidentally, have gone on to careers of great distinction). My teaching career has been enormously stimulating to me. It has enabled me, indeed, to experience a lifetime of learning. Many thoughts came to me in interchanges in classes and seminars, where I was sometimes encouraged in my students' responses, but where I also often discovered that some idea of mine was really goofy.

Let me give a bit of a chronology of my research. Many ethnomusicologists have devoted themselves throughout their careers to one culture. My late colleague David McAllester comes to mind; he spent his life studying the musical culture of the Navajo. Some started with one culture and then, as a kind of mid-life crisis, added a second one. Alan Merriam, for long one of the major leaders of the field, began with the Flathead people of Montana and moved on to the Congo and Rwanda. I'm a bit like Merriam: I started concentrating on Native American music and in my late thirties moved on to Iran and South Asia. However, I never became totally immersed in one culture to the point of being an authority, but instead got interested in particular issues and thus might describe my approach as project-oriented.

In the early days of ethnomusicological fieldwork, and still in the 1950s and 1960s, the typical method of fieldwork was simply—usually without a specific research plan—to show up, hang out, record music, and collect data somewhat indiscriminately. Well, that's what I did at first, more or less, studying with the Blackfoot people in Montana: showed up, asked questions, made recordings. I tried to do what the anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski, great master of fieldwork, recommended in the 1920s: He said to collect texts (songs in my case), to collect structures

(such as, for me, rules as to who may sing what), and to observe the imponderabilia of everyday life (in my case this might be noticing what people say about each others' singing, how members of a singing group interact socially, or their body-language while listening). I was moved in another direction in the 1950s, living in the city of Detroit, by learning about the folk musics of immigrant minorities largely from Eastern and Southern Europe, looking at stability and change.

Then, in 1966, I had the opportunity to go to Iran, to study something totally opposite to Blackfoot and European folk cultures: a complex classical music of highly trained professionals—Persian music. With a more explicit research plan than I had in studying the Blackfoot, I wanted to learn how Persian musicians improvised, how their minds worked, how they made decisions in the course of performance, and I did this by trying to learn the system as Persian students learned it, but also by making a structured series of recordings.

I was fascinated to discover a set of values rather opposite to those of Western music culture. In traditional Western classical musical thought, composition was the great art, and improvisation was seen as a kind of craft once thought to be practiced mainly by a kind of third-world of music making—jazz musicians, minorities, untutored folk, street fiddlers, and, of course, the non-Western world. In Iran, however, it was improvisation that was central, and the composed pieces were a kind of accompanying retinue. I also became interested in the ways in which Persian musicians adapted, used, but also fought off and survived the onslaught of European music in their lives and in those of their audiences.

This interest in intercultural relations expressed in music led me later to spend a half-year in Madras, or Chennai, India, whose music (usually called Carnatic music) Wanda and I had come to love, in order to learn how the intersection of traditional and Western music was played out there in comparison to Tehran. It became clear that the role of music, and the respect given it, were very different in Shi'ite Tehran and Hindu Chennai, and this difference was also the basis for the different ways that Western music penetrated these cultures.

In the 1980s I returned to my interest in ethnography, musical ethnography, the systematic description of culture, and tried my hand at this for the Blackfoot people of Montana. The challenge was to organize and interpret a complex system of ideas about music, even if the music itself was simple to our way of thinking. I'll return to this subject a bit later, but first let me tell you that it also led me to another project about which I'll give a bit of detail. I wished to see what would happen if I looked at the culture in which I lived, the schools of music at Midwestern universities, in the way I had contemplated the musical societies in which I was a stranger. I wished to see what would happen if I asked the question I had posed in Blackfoot country, and in Iran, in my own culture. In writing, I used and negotiated the voices of the experienced ethnomusicologist, the "naive informant," and a mythical "ethnomusicologist from Mars," the absolute outsider. Working at a time in which humanistic scholarship had moved—if I can put it very simply—from principally positivistic to determinedly interpretive approaches, I ended up interpreting a school of music as four different types of societies.

For one thing, I was observing (but also a member of) a kind of religious society ruled by a mythical pantheon of great composers—Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, artists whose names are engraved on our music buildings and in our concert halls—a bit like the Greek or Germanic pantheons. At the top is a mythological dyad—Mozart and Beethoven—symbolizing the opposing values of inspiration and labor. (Don't forget, this is how we see these composers today, not what they were really like in history.) Second, a school of music is a society divided into various sets each of which consists of groups that compete for prestige and resources. Thus, performers compete with scholars, singers with instrumentalists, music educationists with everyone else; and the groups of students, teachers, and administrators, sharing significant goals, nevertheless struggle with each other for advantages. A third interpretation sees the school as a place that welcomes all musics: They are all there, but they are treated unequally. In a set of concentric circles, the center is Western European classical music from about 1750 to 1920. All other music—"early" music,

"new" music, jazz, non-Western, popular, country, rock, and folk music—could or can enter but only on terms of the central classical canon, such as being presented in two-hour concerts with 20-minute intermissions. A fourth interpretation (here I'm going furthest out on a limb): I maintain that we look at much of our culture, including music, with concepts derived from our understanding of fundamental human relationships such as family. Thus, denizens of music schools also tend to think of their musical repertory as a kind of society, with pieces, genres, and types related to each other somewhat like members of a family, social circle, class, or tribe.

In this project focused on my own culture I was, as I said, being much more interpretive than positivistic. Yet I must confess to you that in contrast to many colleagues, I myself haven't really participated in the movements sometimes known as cultural studies and cultural criticism. Actually, I think ethnomusicologists as a whole have not taken all that much to these approaches, partly, I think, because they have always had to be to some extent interpreters of cultures to which they were strangers.

Finally, in the last 15 years or so, I have been concentrating on the history of my field of ethnomusicology, trying to see how it developed, to comprehend the shape of its story so far. I can suggest three overlapping periods using a geographic metaphor: From seeing the world of music as a kind of supercontinent as we tried to find universals, and methods that could help us comprehend all conceivable music, we moved to seeing the world's music as a group of islands, and we emphasized about each what is unique, developing methods for studying music as performers and for writing comprehensive culture-specific ethnographies. Without giving up these earlier approaches, we find ourselves now concentrating on bridges among these islands, learning how musical cultures affect each other, and contemplating the kinds of music that result from intercultural contact. The field is enriched by maintaining a multitude of perspectives that have developed over time, since my student days in the 1950s.

The idea of change leads me to the second half of my talk. A colleague asked me a few years ago whether there were things about which I have changed my mind, and as a result of our discussion I began trying to examine things in which I have, so to speak, had second thoughts, even made U-turns. There were a good many of them. Some of these second thoughts came to me quite recently, and some are parallel to the reorientations that the entire field has experienced. Some of these reversals made my earlier views seem very foolish. Let me give a few examples, which may also illustrate for you further what this field of ethnomusicology is about.

My first U-turn: music as a system of sound but also of concepts. First, a snapshot of the situation just before I got started in college. Between 1928 and 1938, my teacher, George Herzog, published seven major articles, long essays, about Native American musics, each of them consisting of musical notations made from recordings and detailed technical analyses of songs. Yet there were very few words about the activities that these songs accompanied or what people said about them. Then, in 1938, Herzog published a very short and seemingly insignificant article titled "Music in the Thinking of the American Indian." This article is full of interesting observations on the ideas about music held by various Indian nations. One would think that this would have been one of his major contributions, but it appeared in a very obscure magazine and received no attention, and nothing really like it was published until decades later. The article illustrates the typical attitude of the time: Indigenous societies were credited with having songs which they passed on orally, but it was assumed that they had no particular thoughts about them. Indigenous peoples, we believed, didn't talk about these simple melodies, didn't have a theory of music.

I have to confess, I promulgated this attitude in the 1950s. Today the emphasis has shifted completely. We now tend to think: This music may not sound very interesting, but the ideas about it surely are. A major influence—on me and everybody—was the work of Alan Merriam, who proposed that we think of music as consisting of three equally significant sectors: sound, behavior, and concepts. Now this seems obvious, but in 1964 it seemed like a fresh approach.

Let me try to illustrate these sectors with material from the culture of the Blackfoot people. On the music as sound, the songs have the same form, the same contours, a small number of alternative drum rhythm types, a homogeneous singing style. They sound passionate and expressive, but they sound very much alike. Simply as music, the songs may not seem terribly interesting to outsiders, and actually the Blackfoot people themselves don't consider their music to be beautiful or complex. To the contrary, they regard Western music (they call it "white" music) as complicated and difficult to learn—you have to be able to read music, understand harmony. But here is what's significant: The Blackfoot people believe that music is not as important to white people as it is to them. The Blackfoot understand music as governed by a set of important cultural principles. It plays a major role in their conception of the world.

For the Blackfoot, the world of music is a kind of system that parallels the rest of culture. I was told, "the right way to do anything is to sing the right Blackfoot song with it." Now, everyone isn't always singing songs to accompany whatever they are doing. But in the Blackfoot tradition of thought, there is a musical universe that is somehow parallel to the rest of the cultural and natural world. Thus, a fundamental myth tells the story of a man, a great hunter, who has in his tent the dressed skins of all of the area's wildlife, which symbolize the human and natural universe. In a ceremonial exchange, the myth tells us, the hunter gave them to a powerful supernatural figure, a combination of man and beaver, who sang a song for each skin and taught it to the man, who gained the supernatural power that each song contains. The myth shows symbolically the relationship of the natural and the supernatural universes, the latter represented by the songs.

A second part of Blackfoot music theory: songs are indivisible units. This is founded on the belief that songs originally came to humans from visions in which supernatural figures teach songs, and the vision-being, often an animal, sings the song just once. Actually, Blackfoot singers today may say that when learning a song from humans they can learn it in one hearing—whether this is, in fact, usually the case or not. The idea that a song is learned

in one hearing comes from the concept of the vision, in which a vision being sings—or gives—a song to the visionary only once. Here's a related notion: A song is a thing, an object—something that has an existence like a physical object. The idea of a song as something that must be absorbed quickly as a unit also resulted, I think, in their abiding formal simplicity. But the Blackfoot have a complex system of ideas about song ownership: some are owned by individuals; some can be given away while others cannot; some belong to the tribe or to organizations. Incidentally, one rarely hears songs evaluated; as songs come from the supernatural, they themselves are beyond criticism, though singers and performances can be criticized.

These examples may illustrate the interest and the significance of the set of ideas about music in any society, even one whose songs are relatively simple from our perspective. And so this is an area in which I have had second thoughts: from indigenous peoples as having songs but no ideas about them, to peoples whose system of ideas about music gives you far more insight into the culture than merely listening to the songs.

My second U-turn involved two related issues: the concept of music and the origins of music. One of the forefathers of ethnomusicology, the British mathematician Alexander Ellis, wrote in 1885 that all musics were equally natural and thus equally "musics." This has always been ethnomusicology's point of departure. We appreciate, but also disagree with, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow when he wrote, "music is the universal language of mankind." We have preferred to think that music is a cultural universal, yes, but that it is comprised of a lot of distinct musics or, if you will, musical languages. But in recent years I've come to believe that the matter is more complicated, for I now might argue that music may not at all be "one" thing. The world's societies differ in what it means to "have" music in their cultural inventory.

However, first I must ask: What is music, and what makes a sound musical? In language dictionaries, you'll find definitions that tell you about the Western conception of music, because it's hard to fashion a definition that applies to all music in the world,

or one that might be acceptable to many cultures. Indeed, not all of the world's societies recognize music as a category of thought, or actually have a word for "music." The Blackfoot people have only a word, *paskani*, that includes singing, dancing, and ritual. In the Persian language, there is a word for music, *musiqi*, but it applies mostly to instrumental music and would not be applied to chanting or singing the Koran, or certain other forms of non-metric vocal music, which would be called *khandan*. I think it's reasonable to say that for Persians, various sounds are music to a greater or lesser degree, some things being very, others barely, musical. Some African societies have terms for individual genres of music but evidently don't consider them sufficiently the same thing to have a term that unites them. Steven Feld, studying the Kaluli people of Papua New Guinea, found that they had a five-part taxonomy of sound: speech, poetry, song, bird-song, and weeping, all of them in varying degrees musical to us. In Western urban academic culture we accept any sound as music if it occurs in a musical social context such as a concert—like the almost infinite sounds produced in electronic music or the total silence in John Cage's "4'33"."

Why this should be may have something to do with the origins of music. Different peoples have varying ideas about the origins of music. For some it existed before there were humans, or before language; in others, culture already existed and music came into being to satisfy a particular need. These differences might tell us important things about the place of music in their cultures.

But let me go to the matter of origins more academically. When I was a student, we learned five theories: music originated either from emotional speech, or the need to communicate over long distances, or the need to work efficiently, or to facilitate finding a mate, or as a way of communicating with the supernatural. It had to be one of these. None seemed to satisfy, and after about 1950, ethnomusicologists essentially abandoned the topic. In 1998, however, I went to a conference about the origins of music attended mainly by psychologists, animal-communication scientists, linguists, students of prenatal humans, and biological anthropologists. I learned a great deal but found myself always in a minority by suggesting that when these scientists compared bird-

song and whale sounds to music, their point of departure was their experience of Western music, its sound and its conception. They did not take into account the fact that we don't really have an interculturally acceptable definition of music. They needed, I felt, the input of ethnomusicology with its global view of music.

Interestingly, these scientists (who are increasingly the people carrying the ball in the origins debate) argued about different sources of music rather in the style of their nineteenth-century predecessors. Each group thought that music had one source, whether that source be a biological adaptation helping in mating, a way of facilitating cooperation and bonding, a way of communicating with supernatural sources (maybe of expressing sorrow and despair) or a way for mothers to bond with children prenatally and in infancy; or a way for a band or a tribe to frighten enemies. (Can you think of music that might frighten enemies? In Bali, there is a genre, *ketjak*, part of a performance of scenes from the Ramayana, the Hindu epic, in which you hear loud but organized chattering by a large group of men, representing the monkey army getting ready to fight and scaring the enemies of Rama. I can imagine that this type of sound might have accomplished the same goal among some early humans.)

These theories of music's origins—bonding, warfare, finding a mate—represent some kind of sound-production of which most societies today partake. There are love songs and there's virtuosic solo music (widely known as a way to meet girls); there are military bands, the descendants perhaps of battle cries; there is choral singing, patriotic or spiritual, to help people express their ethnic or religious identity, to pray or glorify.

But does it necessarily make sense to believe that all of these phenomena began with one function or genre from which the others were derived and became subdivisions? That's what we used to take for granted. I would now—making my second U-turn—propose that each of these kinds of sound that eventually became art developed independently, each perhaps as a biological adaptation, and that many cultures came to use all of them, but without necessarily thinking they were the same kind of thing.

Only in certain cultures were they eventually considered to belong together. And so I have come to think that the theory of multiple origins of music comes closest to making sense.

My third U-turn involves the abandonment of authenticity. Early comparative musicologists and folk music scholars, even more so, were very concerned with studying the music that an entire society regarded as its own, and so developed the concept of authenticity. This term denotes what was truly representative of a culture and had been so for a long time—what was shared and accepted by all members of a society. Folk song collectors, for example, such as Béla Bartók or Cecil Sharp, wanted to find the true heritage of the villagers, not a recent import from a minority, or something concocted by urban composers, or popular music brought from the city. This was the attitude I learned in my student days. It was important to seek the authentic music of European villagers or Native Americans, but to ignore music that had developed in recent times as a result of contact with white people or the cities. We avoided popular music, in part because of its commercial basis, but more because it was almost inevitably the result of cultural mixes.

The attitude today could hardly be more different. We have made a U-turn. The vast majority of studies in the last 30 or 40 years has involved the interaction of cultures, genres, repertories, styles, instruments. Looking at the programs of conferences, I'm struck by the emphasis on three things: 1) popular music all over the world, music that is mass-mediated; 2) analysis of how things have changed, including presentation of recent developments, and explication of how the world's peoples deal with current challenges; and 3) the study of multicultural venues. I do have to say this: Some of this change is due to the fact that the world has changed—there is a lot more contact among peoples, the world has become urbanized. But I also must admit that the early emphasis on authenticity was unrealistic from the start.

Let me mention very briefly two other U-turns that contrast ethnomusicology in its early days with the present. One is the study of performance as a part of fieldwork and education. When I

was a student, it could have been considered improper to try to learn to play the music we were observing and recording. Today almost all of us try to do that. Performance study in the field, the inclusion of musicians from non-Western societies on music department faculties, and the presence of music ensembles in schools performing the musics of Asia, Africa, the Americas are all taken for granted.

The other U-turn is a movement broadly called "applied ethnomusicology," and results from a question we have often been asked: "Are you doing anyone any good?" And indeed, especially since about 1990, ethnomusicologists have developed an interest in such diverse areas as an intercultural approach to the role of music in medicine and healing and the possible uses of music in conflict resolution; an interest in the legal protection of the world's musicians; in playing a role in elementary and secondary schools; in supporting indigenous societies trying to preserve their heritage; and in helping everyone to accept strange and exotic sounds, and the people who make them, into our musical universe.

So permit me to end with a bit of an ode in praise of my field of ethnomusicology. It has helped to broaden everyone's musical experience; it has changed our perspectives of what the music of the world's peoples is like. It has played a role in furthering equality of societies, and of people within a society. It has worked to reform music education in the world; it has done its part in eliminating artistic and social stereotypes. It has helped shed light on the importance of music everywhere—its importance in social, cultural, and political change. To those making generalizations about music, it raises a forefinger, saying, "wait, there is more to this question," or "what you maintain actually does not apply to many cultures." By broadening our perspectives, it has also helped us—whoever we are—to understand our own culture better. And throughout its history it has, I feel, asked many of the most central and fundamental questions about music—the kinds of questions we wish to continue to ask.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CA